The soul is made of this world and of the other world.
—*Brihad Upanishad*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 52 DECEMBER, 1963 NUMBER 2

"PRACTICAL" POLITICS

IN the section "What Is Practical Theosophy?" in the *Key,* the Enquirer asks: "But who is to decide whether social efforts are wise or unwise?"

This is a question of increasing pertinence, today. While there will never be a "party line" for Theosophists, the relation of social ideas to philosophical principles is becoming more apparent, as the years go by, and the application of the principles laid down by H.P.B. in answer to this question gains correspondingly in importance. She wrote:

> No person and no society can lay down a hard-and-fast rule in this respect. Much must necessarily be left to individual judgment. One general test may, however, be given. Will the proposed action tend to promote that true brotherhood which it is the aim of Theosophy to bring about? No real Theosophist will have much difficulty in applying such a test; once he is satisfied of this, his duty will lie in the direction of forming public opinion. And this can be attained only by inculcating those higher and nobler conceptions of public and private duties which lie at the root of all spiritual and material improvement. In every conceivable case he himself must be a centre of spiritual action, and from him and his own daily life must radiate those higher spiritual forces which alone can regenerate his fellow-men.

The closing sentences of this paragraph make ample distinction between the role of Theosophy and Theosophical students and the sort of effort commonly called "political." The Theosophist knows that the manipulation of existing human energies, without regard for the level of moral attitudes represented by those energies, is an

aimless and wasteful activity, so far as actual progress or human development is concerned. There are, however, social forms which help relate individual perception to the spectrum of decision, and others which reduce perception. There are social forms which give scope to individual responsibility and forms which inevitably refer such responsibility to some central or outside authority. In these days of complex social organization, the recognition of these differences is difficult, but the effort ought to be made, if we are to learn how to identify "those higher and nobler conceptions of public and private duties which lie at the root of all spiritual and mental improvement."

What is becoming evident, in the present, is that these are no longer exclusively "political" questions. Since political philosophy can never be more than the shadow or reflection of individual philosophy, viable social forms depend ultimately on the idea of the self which prevails in any society—the root of all social reform and constructive change. What does not elevate and refine the idea of the self is a merely political maneuver, in social affairs. What does not rest upon the capacity of individual man to grow in perception and sense of obligation, is usually an exploitation of his weaknesses or desires, rather than a proposal for genuine human good.

We live in a time of excessive organization of the external environment of human beings. Not only do the requirements of the technological apparatus create the forms of life, but the military use of technology has become so far-reaching in its effects that hardly any man or any family exists who does not feel its demands and confining influence. These effects, we may be tempted to say, result from the threat of war, and superficially this is no doubt the case. There is, however, a more profound analysis of this condition available in the Theosophic teaching. Mr. Judge writes in his *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*:

> With the culmination of the Dark Age it was . . . natural that the last vestige of sacrifice should disappear. On the ruins of the altar has arisen the temple of the lower self, the shrine of the personal idea. In Europe individualism is somewhat tempered by various monarchical forms of government which do not by any means cure the evil; and in America, being totally unrestricted and forming in fact the basis of independence here, it has culminated. Its bad effects—vaguely as yet shadowing the horizon—might have been avoided if the doctrines of the Wisdom-Religion had been also believed in by the founders of the republic. And

> so, after the sweeping away of the fetters forged by priestly dogma and kingly rule, we find springing up a superstition far worse than that which we have been used to call by the name. It is the superstition of materialism that bows down to a science which leads only to negation.

The prospect of war—hideous enough in its full implications—must none the less be seen as no more than a formidable "ripple of effects," its causes lying deep in the attitudes of modern man. We have fostered a philosophy of indifference to the welfare of others, and its reliance on violence produced, for antidote, a political system of enforced "sacrifice" which became so frightening in its threat to the world of republics that social thinking of any sort stands frozen, today, in defensive postures of anger and defiance. There is, the Theosophist soon sees, no final political solution for this impasse, no diplomatic or even military answer to the dilemmas of the great nations in the present.

The social thinking which may hope to affect for good the social action of the world to come, must start, it is abundantly clear, with philosophical thinking about the ultimate unit of societies—individual man, his nature, his potentialities, and his self-realization. And how can this thinking be effective, how can it touch the root of the problem, without Theosophy, or at least the leaven of Theosophical ideas?

States and nations are not important entities in themselves. They are only temporary vehicles of human evolution. If they cannot serve that evolution, they will have to be returned to the button-maker's mold, and be recast in other forms. Thinking of this sort will almost certainly overtake the creative spirits of the immediate future. The theosophic idea of the individual and of his education in behalf of a natural development of his powers should be the keystone of the progress that is to come. For this particular "world view" is not particularized by reference to a goal which any single culture may seek to achieve. The theosophic view does not belong to the Theosophist in the same sense that religious beliefs belong to religious groups. It belongs to every individual man, however, when he ceases being what Macneile Dixon calls "a prince in misfortune" and accepts his heritage as the ruler of his own kingdom.

ON FIRST ACQUAINTANCE— "THE SECRET DOCRINE"

VI

> Great intellect and too much knowledge are a two-edged weapon in life, and instruments for evil as well as for good. When combined with Selfishness, they will make of the whole of Humanity a footstool for the elevation of him who possesses them, and a means for the attainment of his objects; while, applied to altruistic humanitarian purposes, they may become the means of the salvation of many. (*The Secret Doctrine* II, 163.)

THE phenomenon of learning being used for man's degradation is much in evidence today as we survey the conglomerate of military orders throughout the world, or in our prison systems. It is ironical that many of the most modern prisons, which have had much intelligence poured into their reform, are more subtly degrading to man now than the unintelligent torture-houses of old. Not being able to repudiate and abandon the idea of "revenge," many modern systems have only subtilized their form of torture, making it more mental, and therefore more powerful, although less obvious. In the old style torture-houses, pain was personal and was visibly administered directly to the human body, while today it is often invisible and impersonal.

We might paraphrase a remark of Jesus and say that while retribution will always seek out the evil-doer, in poor case is the man who becomes the instrument of such retribution. In other words, the will to *impose* punishment is different from believing that "rigid justice rules the world," that each man pays the price of the ride he is taking in life, without accepting the need of humanly implemented revenge.

It is said that for one human to correctly judge another, he must be of another order of consciousness, and that when he reaches such a state he will see that the whole concept of judgment is pernicious; that is, if we are all of one fabric, the cloth as a whole has its requirements for adjustment among the parts. Instead of *correcting* the ripples caused in the pond of nature by an evil-doer, human law

generally throws another rock into the pond, thus complicating and increasing the karmic problem rather than erasing it.

It may be that by patiently suffering the evil deed, and recognizing its doer as a brother, we set up a counteracting tendency that weakens his faith in the deed he has done. Similarly, our personal lives are not mended by fighting and resisting a degrading habit, but by the combination of abandoning it and replacing it with a countervailing habit that drinks up the attention and energy of the old. Thus, we might help the mistaken man to abandon his ways by mirroring in our lives another and better way.

In this latter case there is an interesting protection, for if our knowledge of a "better way" turns out to have been wrong, we will not have directly harmed our brother by imposing it upon him. And he may turn out to be a catalytic example for us. If a man discovered a law of sacrificial love inside himself, who knows what reforms might silently arise on this planet without the clash and clatter of administered goodness? This idea seems strongly suggested by the following passage:

> Kama is the first conscious, *all embracing desire* for universal good, love, and for all that lives and feels, needs help and kindness, the first feeling of infinite tender compassion and mercy that arose in the consciousness of the creative ONE FORCE, as soon as it came into life and being as a ray from the ABSOLUTE. Says the *Rig Veda,* "Desire first arose in IT, which was the primal germ of mind, and which Sages, searching with their intellect, have discovered in their heart to be the bond which connects Entity with non-Entity," or *Manas* with pure *Atma-Buddhi.* There is no idea of *sexual* love in the conception. Kama is preeminently the divine desire of creating happiness and love; and it is only ages later, as mankind began to materialize by anthropomorphization its grandest ideals into cut and dried dogmas, that Kama became the power that gratifies desire on the animal plane. . . . The allegory about Siva, the "Great Yogin," reducing Kama to ashes by the fire from his *central* (or third) *Eye,* for inspiring the Mahadeva with thoughts of his wife, while he was at his devotions—is very suggestive as it is said that he thereby reduced Kama to his primeval spiritual form. (*The Theosophical Glossary.*)

The Theosophical teachings are meant to call to life elements of our nature that are relatively dead to us, elements either denied or unused. They do not so much offer us something to learn as the means of making our intellect a self-fulfilling instrument. Even then,

they teach us only if we want to do the work which our particular condition requires—a work unique to each one. Faith in a leader outside one's self tends to obscure the ability to awaken and meet life on terms natural to one's own condition.

We see an illustration of man's thirst to be either a follower or a leader in the dual reaction of her contemporaries to Madame Blavatsky. Some wanted her to follow them and revise her vision of Truth to fit theirs; while others ignored her teaching by trying to set themselves up as little "Blavatskys." Because she rejected both of these reactions, both critics and sycophants fell away, unable to accept the problems of *independence*.

Especially were they unable to accept the idea of independent altruism. Her critics and admirers found it difficult enough that she urged them to become independent, but that it was to be a self-sacrificial independence, one of discovering *how to recognize* the royal talisman of duty peculiar to one's own condition—*this* was adding insult to injury. Again and again we see her return to the theme that help for the race can only come through individuals who have discovered their own natural pattern of work.

Even in the section about political reform in *The Key to Theosophy,* we see her presenting the idea that political betterment will be born from regenerated individuals, that it will be a reflection of an accomplished fact among those who have begun the work of self-renewal and self-inspiration; those who have realized that there is no help outside of us until we work inside our life; that the universal soul of man is intimated, or discovered inside ourselves as we try to discover *what it is that we owe* the human race.

The more we realize that we do not stand outside of nature like some extra-cosmic god and operate upon the universal matrix, but are part of that matrix ourselves, our duty to all will be more clearly seen and naturally fulfilled.

We can, if we so decide, appear in this visible framework of relationships for one purpose only: to intelligently sacrifice the visible to that larger matrix. The good sense of such a choice becomes evident if we view all life as a type of sacrifice, moving from birth to death. Now how this trip toward death, or the invisible, is made, is crucial. Once born, we can't avoid making the trip, but we can and do decide how it is to be made. Our effect upon the environ-

ment in which we are born is important in many ways, one of which is that we are building our nest for the next return.

Neither friend nor neighbor can tell us how to travel, or discover the fulfilling way for us to journey toward the invisible—that change which men call "death." Yet, if we learn to look to ourselves as part of the "wholeness," thinking of everything as inside with there being no outside, some interesting ideas might result.

For instance, if what we used to think of as a "disagreeable person" becomes juxtaposed to us, he is no longer outside of us but part of the *body of our consciousness,* and thus it is no longer a matter of curing him or changing him as an element outside of ourselves, but rather a problem of discovering what caused this to occur in our sphere of consciousness. Even then there is not so much a value-judgment involved as one of discovering the chain of cause and effect that led to the experience, in the same sense that we might view the rain or a storm cloud as also being inside of us and therefore not to be liked or disliked any more than we like or dislike our thumb or eye. To oversimplify the situation, we might say that we do not blame the sun for giving us sunburn, but investigate the cause, namely, our system of choices; likewise when Mr. X causes unpleasantness for us we do not blame him but rather investigate and pass judgment upon our own system of choices and philosophy from which those choices were born. Even this last judgment is not a condemnatory one, but a working decision, so-to-say, in the midst of getting on with the business of life. Immediately upon making such an *ad hoc* decision, we begin to test it by its effect upon our sphere of consciousness, and sooner or later must see a better and more fulfilling one with which to replace it.

As we get used to seeing life in terms of fabric rather than threads, our path becomes more natural, our duty more evident.

letters • questions • comment

It seems inevitable that an enthused Theosophical student finds himself in a paradoxical position regarding dissemination of basic Theosophical ideas. In the first place, he should be the first to know that philosophical comprehension must be won by "self-induced and self-devised efforts"—so that attempts to proselyte or convert are ill-advised on principle. On the other hand, he feels a strong impulsion to express and discuss Theosophy with men of many differing persuasions.

In encountering the often-cynical "man of the world," the confirmed skeptic, a Theosophist may find that any expression of optimism in regard to an improved evolution of humanity will usually elicit only derision. But one does, nevertheless, wish for some solid line of reasoning to defend idealism—in respect to international relations, public and private affairs, as well as in the fields of religion and philosophy. Just what sort of "logic" can the Theosophist use without finding himself in the position of defending his own doctrine of "perfectibility," et cetera?

Faith in the possibility of "future human evolution" depends upon belief that men are capable of transcending the attitudes which make mutual suspicion the rule in political affairs. "Human nature never changes" is a dictum which may hold only so long as people believe it. The primary psychological fact is that man, simply because he *is* man, has some conception of a marked difference between the world that is and the world that "might be"—if it could only be brought into existence. Because man has idealistic *capacity,* even the cynic feels a compulsion to make sour comments on the venality of politics, the irresponsibility of Big Business, the egocentrism of most people in interpersonal relationships. All such expressions require an expenditure of psychic energy, for even negativism must be given embodiment in formulation and argument. The hopeful man, who talks about a better world to come, is simply expressing his psychic energy differently. He may be wrong; but his preoccupation with optimism, his penchant for treating men *as if* they can be principled

and altruistic, certainly is not going to make other people more cynical nor the world a worse place to inhabit. So, the argument could run, Why not hope and dream a little, since nothing can be lost, and the possibility always exists that men who talk idealism may learn how to practice it, and that others in turn may learn from them?

The whole of Theosophical philosophy can be analyzed by reference to different conceptions of time. It is true enough that the man who wants a harmonious world in a hurry is doomed to disappointment. History teaches us that the revolutionaries who were in a hurry seldom precipitated anything except bloodshed. The sage, according to definition, is one who "builds for endlessness," in the words of *The Upanishads*. Optimism and idealism, for the sage, are not based upon the expectation that a better world will come about immediately, but rather upon a conviction that a better world is here for any man, at any time, when his own attitudes are sufficiently transformed. The doctrines of Karma and reincarnation simply provide a prospectus which assists in such transformation.

The closing passages of W. Macneile Dixon's *Human Situation* are apropos:

> Immortality is a word which stands for the stability or permanence of that unique and precious quality we discern in the soul, which, if lost, leaves nothing worth preservation in the world.
>
> How simple then is our duty—loyalty to life, to the ship's company and to ourselves, that it may not be through our surrender that the great experiment of existence, whose issue remains in doubt, come to an end in nothingness. "We must not obey," said Aristotle, "those who urge us, because we are human and mortal, to think human and mortal thoughts; in so far as we may we should practise immortality, and omit no effort to live in accordance with the best that is in us."
>
> What a handful of dust is man to think such thoughts! Or is he, perchance, a prince in misfortune, whose speech at times betrays his birth? I like to think that, if men are machines, they are machines of a celestial pattern, which can rise above themselves, and, to the amazement of the watching gods, acquit themselves as men. I like to think that this singular race of indomitable, philosophising, poetical beings, resolute to carry the banner of Becoming to unimaginable heights, may be as interesting to the gods as they to us, and that they will stoop to admit these creatures of promise into their divine society.

In respect to the all-important question of "time," it is apparent from the Theosophical point of view that we are involved in two types of duration: the one, phenomenological time and the other, subjective. Herbert Fingarette's *The Self in Transformation* has an interesting observation on this subject:

> The enduring substantial Self neither begins with birth nor ends with death. This Self has a very special relation to time. The Self, being "noumenal" rather than phenomenal, is not *in* phenomenal time, the "subjective" time-order; it is a *source* of the order of (subjective) time. . . . Time, for the enlightened one, becomes light, indeed transparent; for the unenlightened it is often confused, always a burden. This is the fact whether we take it within a karmic or a psychoanalytic framework.

"ESOTERIC SCIENCE"

To my mind there is a great field of science which is as yet quite closed to us. I refer to the science which proceeds in terms of life and is established on data of living experience and of sure intuition. Call it subjective science if you like. Our objective science of modern knowledge concerns itself only with phenomena. . . . It is perfect as far as it goes. But to regard it as exhausting the scope of human possibility in knowledge seems to be just puerile. Our science is a science of the dead world. Even biology never considers life, but only mechanistic functioning and apparatus of life. I honestly think that the great pagan world of which Egypt and Greece were the last living terms [of time which] had a vast and perhaps perfect science of its own, a science in terms of life. . . . I believe that this great science once was universal, established all over the then existing globe. I believe it was esoteric, invested in a large priesthood. Just as mathematics and mechanics and physics are defined and expounded in the same way in the universities of China or Bolivia or London or Moscow today, so, it seems to me, in the great world previous to ours a great science and cosmology were taught esoterically in all countries of the globe, Asia, Polynesia, America, Atlantis and Europe.

—D. H. LAWRENCE

THE TIMELESS KABIRI

FROM the very day when the first mystic found the means of communication between this world and the worlds of the invisible host, between the sphere of matter and that of pure spirit, he concluded that to abandon this mysterious science to the profanation of the rabble was to lose it.

The *Kabiri* or the *Kabirim* [the name is Phoenician] were Deities and very mysterious gods with the ancient nations, including the Israelites, and were held in the highest veneration at Thebes, in Lemnos, Phrygia, Macedonia, and especially at Samothrace. They were mystery gods, no profane having the right to name or speak of them. Herodotus makes of them Fire-gods and points to Vulcan as their father. The Kabiri presided over the Mysteries, and their *real number* has never been revealed, their occult meaning being very sacred.

The Kabiri were also Assyrian gods. In Hebrew the name means "the mighty ones," *Gibborim.* In Samothrace, an island famous and renowned for its Mysteries all over the world—perhaps the oldest ever established in our present race—they were the *Samothraces.* The latter are considered identical with the Kabiri, Dioscuri and Corybantes. The names of the Samothraces were mystical, denoting Pluto, Ceres or Proserpine, Bacchus and Æsculapius, or Hermes. At one time all the deities *connected with fire,* whether they were divine, infernal or volcanic, were called Kabirian. With the Christians, however, they are now devils, although the modern Archangels are the direct transformation of these same Kabiri.

Those who know anything of the Samothracian mysteries will remember that the generic name of the Kabiri was the "Holy Fires," which created on seven localities of the island of Electria (or Samothrace) the "Kabir born of the Holy Lemnos" (the island sacred to Vulcan). According to Pindar, this Kabir, whose name was Adamas, was, in the traditions of Lemnos, the type of the primitive

---

NOTE.—Collated from the writings of H. P. Blavatsky.

man born from the bosom of the Earth. He was the archetype of the first males in the order of generation, and was one of the seven autochthonous ancestors or progenitors of mankind.

A Mystery, imparted to but very few initiates, was enacted once every seven years during the Mysteries, and the records of it are found self-imprinted on the leaves of the Thibetan sacred tree, the mysterious Kounboum, in the Lamasery of the holy adepts. In the shoreless ocean of space radiates the central, spiritual, and *invisible* sun. The universe is his body, spirit, and soul; and after this ideal model are framed all "things." These three emanations are the three lives, the three degrees of the gnostic *Pleroma,* the three "Kabalistic Faces," for the ANCIENT of the ancient, the holy of the aged, the great En-Soph, "has a form and then he has no form." The invisible "assumed a form when he called the universe into existence," says the *Sohar,* the Book of Splendor. The *first* light is His Soul, the Infinite, Boundless, and Immortal breath; under the efflux of which the universe heaves its mighty bosom, infusing *intelligent* life throughout creation. The second emanation condenses cometary matter and produces form within the cosmic circle; sets the countless worlds floating in the electric space, and infuses the *unintelligent,* blind life-principle into every form. The *third* produces the whole universe of physical matter; and as it keeps gradually receding from the Central Divine Light its brightness wanes and it becomes DARKNESS and the BAD—pure matter, the "gross purgations of the celestial fire" of the Hermetists.

When the Central Invisible, the "highest and greatest Creative POWER," saw the efforts of the divine *Scintilla* [Over-Soul], unwilling to be dragged lower down into the degradation of matter, to liberate itself, he permitted it to shoot out from itself a *monad,* over which, attached to it as by the finest thread, the Divine Scintilla had to watch during its ceaseless peregrinations from one form to another. Thus the monad was shot down into the first form of matter and became encased in a stone; then, in course of time, through the combined efforts of *living fire* and *living water,* both of which shone their *reflection* upon the stone, the monad crept out of its prison to sunlight as a lichen. From change to change it went higher and higher; the monad, with every new transformation borrowing more of the radiance of its parent, *Scintilla* (Soul), which approached it nearer at every transmigration. For "the First Cause had willed it to proceed in this order"; and destined it to creep on higher until

the physical form became once more the Adam *of dust,* shaped in the image of the Adam Kadmon (Pitris).

Before undergoing its last earthly transformation, the external covering of the monad, from the moment of its conception as an embryo, passes in turn, once more, through the phases of the several kingdoms. In its fluidic prison it assumes a vague resemblance at various periods of the gestation to plant, reptile, bird, and animal, until it becomes a human embryo. At the birth of the future man, the monad, radiating with all the glory of its immortal parent [Dhyani-Buddha] which watches it from the seventh sphere, becomes *senseless.* It loses all recollection of the past, and returns to consciousness but gradually, when the instinct of childhood gives way to reason and intelligence. After the separation between the life-principle (astral spirit) and the body takes place, the liberated soul—Monad, exultingly rejoins the mother and father spirit [i.e., the Fire-Kabiri], the radiant Augoeides, and the two, merged into one, forever form, with a glory proportioned to the spiritual purity of the past earth-life, the Adam who has completed the circle of necessity, and is freed from the last vestige of his physical encasement. Henceforth, growing more and more radiant at each step of his upward progress, he mounts the shining path that ends at the point from which he started around the Grand Cycle.

If one studies comparative Theogony, it is easy to find that the secret of these "Fires" was taught in the Mysteries of every ancient people, pre-eminently in Samothrace. There is not the smallest doubt that the Kabiri, the most arcane of all the ancient deities, gods and men, great deities and Titans, are identical with the Kumaras and Rudras headed by Kartikeya [*Mars,* personifying the powers of the LOGOS]—a Kumara also. This is quite evident even exoterically; and these Hindu deities were, like the Kabiri, *the personified sacred Fires of the most occult powers of Nature.* The several branches of the Aryan Race, the Asiatic and the European, the Hindu and the Greek, did their best to conceal their true nature, if not their importance. As in the case of the Kumaras, the number of the Kabiri is uncertain. Some say that they were three or four only; others say seven. Thus, while in Samothrace and the oldest Egyptian temples they were the great Cosmic Gods (the seven and the *forty-nine* Sacred Fires), in the Grecian fanes their rites became mostly phallic, therefore to the profane, obscene. In the latter case they were three and four, or seven—the male and female principles—(the *crux*

ansata), this division showing why some classical writers held that they were only 3, while others named 4. And these were, the Kabiri Axieros (in his female aspect, Demeter); Axio-Kersa (Persephone); Axiokersos (Pluto or Hades); and Kadmos or Kadmilos (Hermes—not the ithyphallic Hermes mentioned by Herodotus . . . but "he of the sacred legend," explained only during the Samothracian mysteries). They may very well stand for the *alter-egos* of the four Kumaras, Sanat-Kumara, Sananda, Sanaka, and Sanatana. The former deities, whose reputed father was Vulcan, were often confounded with the Dioscuri, Corybantes, Anaces, etc., just as the Kumara, whose reputed father is Brahmâ (or rather, the "Flame of his Wrath") . . . were confounded with the Asuras, the Rudras, and the Pitris, for the simple reason that they are all one—i.e., correlative Forces and Fires.

The Kabirim, the "mighty ones," are identical with our primeval Dhyan-Chohans, with the incorporeal and corporeal Pitris, and with all the rulers and instructors of the primeval races, which are referred to as the Gods and Kings of the divine Dynasties. It matters little whether it is Isis, or Ceres—the "Kabiria"—or again the Kabiri. Every nation has either the seven and ten Rishi-Manus and Prajapatis; the seven and *ten* Ki-y; or ten and seven Amshaspends (six exoterically, if Ormazd, their chief and Logos, is excluded); ten and seven Chaldean Anedots, ten and seven Sephiroth, etc., etc. One and all have been derived from the primitive Dhyan-Chohans of the Esoteric doctrine, or the "Builders" of the *Stanzas*. From Manu, Thot-Hermes, Oannes Dagon, and Edris-Enoch, down to Plato and Panadores, all tell us of seven *divine* Dynasties, of seven Lemurian and seven Atlantean divisions of the earth; of the seven primitive and *dual* gods who descend from their celestial abode and reign on Earth, teaching mankind Astronomy, Architecture, and all the other sciences that have come down to us.

These Beings appear first as "gods" and Creators; then they merge in nascent man, to finally emerge as "divine-Kings and Rulers." But this fact has been gradually forgotten. As Bosuage shows, the Egyptians themselves confessed that science flourished in their country only since Isis-Osiris, whom they continue to adore as gods, "though they had become Princes in human form." And he adds of Osiris-Isis (the divine androgyne): "It is said that this Prince (Isis-Osiris) built cities in Egypt, stopped the overflowing of the

Nile; invented agriculture, the use of the vine, music, astronomy, and geometry."

It is the Kabiri who are credited with having revealed, by *producing* corn or wheat, the great boon of agriculture. What Isis-Osiris, the once living Kabiria, has done in Egypt, that Ceres is said to have done in Sicily; they all belong to one class. To them, the Kabiri or Titans, is ascribed the invention of letters (the *Devanagari,* or the alphabet and language of the gods), of laws and legislature, of architecture, as of the various modes of magic, so-called; and of the medical use of plants. Hermes, Orpheus, Cadmus, Asclepius, all those demi-gods and heroes, to whom is ascribed the revelation of sciences to men, and in whom Bryant, Faber, Bishop Cumberland, and so many other Christian writers, too zealous for the plain truth, would force posterity to see only pagan copies of one and sole prototype, named Noah—are all *generic* names.

As to the Jewish Noah, no Occultist would ever think of dispossessing him of his prerogatives, if he is claimed to be an Atlantean; for this would simply show that the Israelites repeated the story of Vaivasvata-Manu, Xisuthrus, and so many others, and that they only changed the name, to do which they had the same right as any other nation or tribe. What we object to is the literal acceptation of Biblical chronology, as it is absurd, and in accord with neither geological data nor reason. Moreover, if Noah was an Atlantean, then he was a Titan, a giant, as Faber shows; and if a giant, then why is he not shown as such in *Genesis?* The Titans and Kabirs have been invariably made out by the theologians and some pious symbologists as indissolubly connected with the grotesque personage called *devil,* and every proof to the contrary has been hitherto as invariably rejected and ignored; therefore, the Occultist must neglect nothing which may tend to defeat this conspiracy of slander.

Neither the Chaldean nor the Biblical deluge (the stories of the Babylonian Xisuthrus and Noah) is based on the universal or even on the Atlantean deluges, recorded in the Indian allegory of Vaivasvata-Manu. They are all the *exoteric allegories based on the esoteric mysteries* of Samothrace. If the older Chaldees knew the esoteric truth of Samothrace in the Puranic legends, the other nations were aware only of the Samothracian mystery, and allegorized it. They adapted it to their astronomical and anthropological, or rather phallic, notions. Samothrace is known *historically* to have been famous

in antiquity for a deluge, which submerged the country and reached the top of the highest mountains; an event which happened before the age of the Argonauts. It was overflowed very suddenly by the waters of the Euxine, regarded up to that time as a lake. If, while coupling with this the fact that Samothrace was colonized by the Phoenicians, and before them by the mysterious Pelasgians who came from the East, one remembers also the identity of the *mystery* gods of the Phoenicians, Chaldeans, and Israelites, it will be easy to discover whence came also the confused account of the Noachian deluge.

Thus it is very important to prevent fanatics from monopolising all the facts in history and legend, and from fathering their distortions of truth, history, and legend *upon one man.* Noah, is either a *myth* along with the others or one whose legend was built upon the Kabirian or Titanic tradition, as taught in Samothrace. He has, therefore, no claim to be monopolised by either Jew or Christian. If, as Faber tried to demonstrate at such cost of learning and research, Noah is an Atlantean, and a Titan, and his family are Kabiri or pious Titans, etc., then biblical chronology falls by its own weight, and along with it all the patriarchs—the antediluvian and pre-Atlantean Titans. As now discovered and proven, Cain is Mars, the god of power and generation. Tubal-Cain is a Kabir, "an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron"; or, if this will please better, he is one with Hephaestos or Vulcan—Vul-cain, the greatest god also with the later Egyptians, and the greatest Kabir. The god of *time* was *Chium* in Egypt, or Saturn, or Seth, and Chium is the same as Cain. Jabal is taken from the Kabiri—instructors in agriculture, "such as have cattle," and Jubal is "the father of those who handle the harp," he, or *they* who fabricated the harp for Kronos and the trident for Poseidon.

The history or "fables" about the mysterious Telchines, fables echoing each and all the archaic events of our esoteric teachings, furnish us with a key to the origin of Cain's genealogy; they give the reason why the Roman Catholic Church identifies "the accursed blood" of Cain and Ham with Sorcery, and makes it responsible for the Deluge. Were not the Telchines, it is argued, the mysterious iron-workers of Rhodes; they who were the first to raise statues to the gods, furnish them with weapons, and men with magic arts? And is it not they who were destroyed by a deluge at the command of Zeus, as the *Cainites* were by that of Jehovah? The Telchines are simply the Kabiri and the Titans, in another form. They are the

Atlanteans also. "Like Lemnos and Samothrace," says Decharme, "Rhodes, the birthplace of the Telchines, is an island of volcanic formation." The island of Rhodes emerged suddenly out of the seas, after having been previously engulfed by the Ocean, say the traditions. Like Samothrace it is connected in the memory of men with the Flood legends.

The Kabiri are in truth "the great, beneficent and powerful Gods," as Cassius Hermone calls them. At Thebes, the *Kabirim* Kore and Demeter had a sanctuary, and at Memphis, the Kabiri had a temple so sacred that none, excepting the priests, were suffered to enter their holy precincts. During the Samothracian Mysteries, "after the distribution of pure Fire a new life began." This was the "new birth" that is alluded to by Jesus in his nocturnal conversation with Nicodemus. "Initiated into the most blessed of all the Mysteries, being ourselves pure . . . we become just and holy with wisdom." "He *breathed* on them and saith unto them, 'Take of Holy Pneuma'." And this simple act of will-power was sufficient to impart vaticination in its nobler and more perfect form if both the initiator and the initiated were worthy of it. To deride this gift, even in its present aspect, "as the corrupt offspring and lingering remains of an ignorant age of superstition, would be as unphilosophical as it is wrong," as remarked by a 19th century minister. "To remove the veil which hides our vision from the future, has been attempted in all ages of the world."

The fact that, astronomically, the Titans-Kabirim were also the generators and regulators of the seasons, and cosmically the great Volcanic Energies, the gods presiding over all the metals and terrestrial works, does not prevent them from being, in their original divine characters, the beneficent Entities who, symbolized in *Prometheus,* brought light to the world, and endowed humanity with intellect and reason. They are pre-eminently in every theogony, especially in the Hindu, the sacred Divine FIRES, 3, 7, or 49, according as the allegory demands it. They were universally worshipped, and their origin is lost in the night of time. Yet whether propitiated in Phrygia, Phoenicia, the Troad, Thrace, Egypt, Lemnos or Sicily, their cult was always connected with fire; their temples ever built in the most volcanic localities, and in exoteric worship they belonged to Chthonian Divinities. Therefore Christianity has made of them *infernal* gods. Nor must it be lost sight of that the Kabiri were of both sexes, as also terrestrial, celestial and kosmic. While in their

later capacity of the Rulers of sidereal and terrestrial powers, a purely geological phenomenon was symbolized in the persons of those rulers, they were also, in the beginning of times, the rulers of mankind. When incarnated as Kings of the "divine Dynasties," they gave the first impulse to civilizations, and directed the mind with which they had endued men to the invention and perfection of all the arts and sciences. Thus the Kabiri are said to have appeared as the benefactors of men, and as such they lived for ages in the memory of nations.

They had other names in the "sacred language," known but to the hierophants and priests; and "it was not lawful to mention them." We find them pronounced, albeit slightly disfigured, as known in that same sacred language—by the populations of Siam, Thibet, and India. And on the walls of the Cambodian Nagkon-Wat are to be found at this day several repetitions of the Kabirian gods of Samothrace. This may have escaped the notice of archaeologists, but upon stricter inspection they will be found there, as well as the reputed father of the Kabiri—Vulcan, with his bolts and implements, having near him a king with a sceptre in his hand, which is the counterpart of that of Cheronaea, or the "scepter of Agamemnon," so-called, said to have been presented to him by the lame god of Lemnos. In another place we find Vulcan, recognizable by his hammer and pincers, but under the shape of a monkey, as usually represented by the Egyptians. It is easy to see that the excavators of Ellora, the builders of the old Pagodas, the architects of Copan and of the ruins of Central America, those of Nagkon-Wat, and those of the Egyptian remains were, if not of the same race, at least of the same religion—the one taught in the oldest Mysteries. And if, as sometimes thought, Nagkon-Wat is essentially a Buddhist temple, how comes it to have on its walls *basso relievos* of completely an Assyrian character and Kabirian gods which, though universally worshipped as the most ancient of the Asiatic mystery-gods, had already been abandoned 200 years B.C., and the Samothracian mysteries themselves completely altered?

YOUTH FORUM

It is taught that after a long period of evolution each individual soul is at last reunited with the Absolute, and a great period of Pralaya begins. Yet certainly the individual (so long as he remains an individual) is finite, and the finite can never comprehend the infinite, any more than the infinite can comprehend the finite (see Secret Doctrine *I, 56). Might it not then be considered a contradiction to speak of the individual as being reunited with the Absolute? Might not in fact the word "annihilation" be more applicable here than "reunion"?*

Perhaps the relationship between the individual consciousness and Absolute Consciousness is not one in which "comprehending" has any place, so long as we consider that word synonymous with "understanding"; for surely the human mind cannot hope to understand this process of re-absorption by which the single merges completely with the All—and yet is somehow not lost. It does indeed seem a contradiction (the word "paradox" seems hardly strong enough here); and in fact when H.P.B. treats of this question directly (*S.D.* I, 265-6), she amplifies rather than answers the question, makes comparisons and then declares the comparisons to be imperfect, and finally leaves the reader dangling without any secure logical sequence. Speaking of that day when "the spark will re-become the Flame . . ." she declares that "in *Paranirvana*—when *Pralaya* will have reduced not only material and psychical bodies, but even the spiritual *Ego(s)* to their original principle—the Past, Present, and even Future Humanities, like all things, will be one and the same." She continues:

> Is this annihilation, as some think? . . . To see in Nirvana annihilation amounts to saying of a man plunged in a sound *dreamless* sleep—*one that leaves no impression on the physical memory and brain, because the sleeper's Higher Self is in its original state of absolute consciousness* during those hours—that he, too, is annihilated. The latter simile answers only to one side of the question—the most material; since *re-absorption* is by no means such a "dreamless sleep," but, on the contrary, *absolute* existence,

> an unconditioned unity, or a state, to describe which human language is absolutely and hopelessly inadequate. The only approach to anything like a comprehensive conception of it can be attempted solely in the panoramic visions of the soul, through spiritual ideations of the divine monad. Nor is the individuality—*nor even the essence of the personality,* if any be left behind—lost, because re-absorbed. For, however limitless—from a human standpoint—the paranirvanic state, it has yet a limit in Eternity. Once reached, the same monad will *re-emerge* therefrom, as a still higher being, on a far higher plane, to recommence its cycle of perfected activity. The human mind cannot in its present stage of development transcend, scarcely reach this plane of thought. It totters here, on the brink of incomprehensible Absoluteness and Eternity.

Yet if one's feelings of mystification, even of contradiction, are only intensified by this passage, why should he be afraid of that contradiction? Might it not be possible for contradictory elements to exist within the realm of Universal Truth? One logical argument may refute another, but are not all logical arguments confounded when faced with eternity and infinity? For logic seems to proceed in a horizontal line from premises to conclusions, but universals find their symbol in the circle, a circle which may intersect our lines of logic at more than one point; a circle on whose circumference all points exist at the same time, even though they may be diametrically opposite to one another. And surely, if life's mysterious workings were forced into the hands of human logic, nothing would grow or even move, not even on the physical plane; for before an object could be moved a fraction of an inch, it would have to be moved an even smaller fraction, and before reaching that smaller fraction, it would have to reach a still smaller fraction, and so on, fraction dividing fraction infinitely; but this process of division would never reach that mystical point at which a standing object becomes transformed into an object which is in motion. That point (though governed by law) is completely non-logical; it is a miracle and a contradiction; it is surrounded by the Holy Spirit.

In our country we mistrust holy things; they embarrass us; we would like to reduce everything to understandable formulas, human beings included. This tendency (which strikes this student as being in essence entirely opposed to the Masters' work of reducing all operations of the universe to a few glyphs and symbols) has had serious detrimental effects on our social and individual lives; for, besides encouraging superficial analyses and judgments, it has re-

duced our capacity to feel a primeval kind of awe in the face of existence, and has in fact taken many people away from the inextricably complex and often contradictory mesh of intertwining threads of which manifested reality is composed.

We can see the effect of this tendency in a thousand ways; for example, the American movie industry, faced with the simple fact that no actual living person is entirely predictable in his thoughts or actions, continues to cast types—two-dimensional characters that can easily be arranged to fit any plot. Most anthropologists will grant man only three dimensions, some psychologists will grant him four, but who in our logic-bound world is willing to grant him all that are rightfully his? Who will admit that his comings and goings (like the simplest motions of every object) are shrouded in mystery; and that, although his days may fall away from him like leaves, a powerful trunk remains alive to last the winter out, survive many winters, before falling finally back down to the earth?

The presence of contradictions, then, real or apparent, would not necessarily constitute the refutation of a proposition or indicate the misunderstanding of a phenomenon. It is in fact tempting (though rash) to declare that the validity of any statement of universal scope is doubtful unless that statement contains within it at least some possibility of logical contradiction; for more important than intellectual satisfaction is spiritual stimulation; and more important than tidy explanations is an awakening to the mysteries of life.

Sayings from Zen

Living in the world, yet not clinging to or forming attachments for the dust of the world, is the way of a true Zen student.

Every day is a fortunate day for a true student. Time passes but he never lags behind. Neither glory nor shame can move his heart.

Why do you not leave everything to the great law of the universe and pass each day with a peaceful smile?

Zen-Getsu

THE SPIRIT IN ACTION

THE Will, according to Van Helmont, is the first of all powers. Theosophy goes further in defining Will as a seven-storied tabernacle of resistless Force. Will is that which, concentrated in the "hands" of the Raj-Yogi, can be directed to purpose in any or all of the seven states and planes of life. Its purposeful guidance by other mortals is one of varied degree. Will and Yoga, or concentrated devotion to the ideal of human brotherhood maintained as the *raison d'être* of being itself, alone permits the activity of purely spiritual power on this our plane of life. Spirit in action is the activity of highest Will.

As thought of in ordinary life—when at all contemplated—the idea of Will is restricted to feats of prowess such as "the fighting heart" in gymnastics, or to the stubborn bearing of pain, or to the commanding of brain and body faculties to resist sleep in the face of coming challenge, and such like. Or it is spoken of as the power of "mind over matter," including the capacity to influence members of the animal kingdom, subjecting them to "our will." All this, however, has to do only with the activity of some psychic faculties at a low human level. Will is also a universally pervasive force which keeps the whole universe in being. On the cosmic plane it is called Fohat, ceaselessly creative and destructive in its effects. On the plane of nature it is the "will" in matter—*Kama*. In the human being, Will is that which moral determination makes of it.

Being the first of powers and unqualifiedly universal in scope of expression, it is not possible to separate Will from any part of existence. The influence of its activity is therefore omnipresent. There is no single activity in any part of the cosmos without Will as its root and basis, from the silent work of bacteria under the soil to the formation of a nebular world. It is the power and the substance, the essence and its vehicle. It is its own mover as also the result of its movement. It is the reigning spirit of all subdivisions which are called faculties and powers—which are Itself. The ultimate quies-

cent Will, says H. P. Blavatsky, is Atma in Layam. On the mental plane it is the *power* of thought. On the next, the *power* of judgment, of intuitional perception. In the life of the body it shows itself as volition; astrally, as vital force; and at man's intermediate nature, as mortal-immortal. At this point man lives today, for "it is taught that today man shows himself to be moved by *Kama,* passion and desire."

It is determination which causes the activity of the Will. The color of determination will evoke this or another kind of will-force. Fright transforms human will into animal will, and in turn fear may freeze and paralyze the vital will-force, or cause the opposite and quadruple the energies. Such direction, while little enough desirable, is not to be compared with other aspects of animal will in the shape of envy, jealousy, vanity, the disintegrating processes of which forces are possible only to human consciousness. Will is a divine Force. For every atom of its employment by man, will he be held morally responsible. It is the primeval *Fire* at which are lit all other fires, from acids to Akasa.

All acts are the use and conversion of will-force, or energy. By performing concentration in a certain way, the ascetic can make himself acquainted with "the language of the devas, or know what is passing in the mind of the ant." Ascetic faculties are wilful servants. In ordinary men a strong will may be merely strong desire and resolve. Or it may be not. What is the direction of aim, how *conscious* is the act of thought? Herein lies the deciding factor. The "circles" hinted at in the literature of Theosophy, those magnetic rings used by the wicked to influence weaker souls to certain lines of action; the force used by the hypnotist to force *his* will upon his bemused subject; the use of images and all other forms of sorcery, are causes which lead toward the damnation of those individuals who make such use of divine Power. Restraint placed upon the free use of faculties in another is unconscious, when not consciously exercised, "black magic." All too frequently, it may be, the latter is the conscious basis of the salesman's tactics. The held theory of "business a-morality" as a salve for the conscienceless and heartless practices to which every unwary soul is subjected, is hardly sufficient deterrent to nature's policemen which effect her laws in the realm of the occult. There is a special karmic action, it is taught, attached to these uses of divine Force.

One who takes his conscious evolution into serious consideration bears the marks of this higher manasic activity. He is on the way to

regaining a heritage among the "Will-born Lords." What sort of man need such be? Is he highly schooled and degreed in all the latest research findings? Need he possess particularly outstanding aptitudes? Need he be "well advanced"? The answer to this is obvious. These qualifications, as St. Paul said, may be but "tinkling cymbals" when not accompanied by an interior feeling of the divinity of his Ego-ship. A man may voluntarily perform those acts from which most men shrink, and his Will never suffer. He may go to prison by surrendering himself as an act of will; maintain the condition in penal servitude while to all appearance seeming the degenerate his cell-mate may be in fact. Yet, the compulsion of the man of will-born acts is an inner one; the difference between this state, and any other, is almost inconceivable unless experienced. Such a man comes out of the "ordeal by fire" unshaken, unconquered by external forces, possessed of an inflexible determination whose strength can not be measured.

There are two paths open to men in this transition age, but there is no path left between them. One, it is said, leads to adeptship, the other, to mediumship. The *use* of the Will propels to either; what the motivating force is behind its use, at every step of the way, determines the outcome.

"THE LARGEST POSSIBLE FAITH"

The fundamental human value is the freedom to choose, and, if need be, to elect painful effort, dangerous risks, and responsibilities for the sake of some transcendental value. It is this way of life which differentiates man from the rest of creation. It corresponds to a faith more entrancing and more comprehensive than the view of the good life by the Greek philosophers, than the vision of heaven by the Medievalists, than the mathematical world conceived by the rational scientists, than the utopian societies imagined by political reformers. It is the largest possible faith, simply because it is open on an endless future with unlimited possibilities.

—RENÉ DUBOS

on the lookout

Prayer Ruling—Informative Discussion

Passages appearing in an article in the *Daily Trojan* (Sept. 30), student newspaper of the University of Southern California, are an indication that the religious emphasis, when it is combined with the university atmosphere, inevitably liberalizes and broadens itself. USC is officially Methodist in background and orientation, but this featured article by a graduate student, Edward Moritz, Jr., is a blunt statement for the necessity of nonsectarianism. Mr. Moritz begins by pointing out an often-neglected consideration—that despite constitutional efforts to devaluate partisanship, a nearly exclusive Christian point of view has often been represented in government practice and policy. Mr. Moritz writes:

> In fact, the federal government has never been completely neutral on religion—mainly because there has been no large segment of the population which did not believe in some kind of God.
>
> In practice, the constitutional separation of church and state has been manifested by the overwhelming Protestant majority tolerating other religious minorities. Much Protestant, or "non-denominational," religious practice crept into various areas of government—prayers and Bible lessons were taught in public schools, chaplains said prayers at legislatures and were in some instances employed by the government, religious mottos were used on money.

A Partial Historical Shift

Mr. Moritz' account continues, explaining why the influx of many non-Christian viewpoints was necessary before the full import of the Bill of Rights could be widely understood:

> With the great influx of Europeans in the latter half of the 19th century as well as the changes wrought in religious thought by the theories of Darwin, Freud and Marx, the religious balance began shifting. The Protestant majority narrowed as Catholics, Jews, deists and atheists increased in numbers. Also, sects which were not in the mainstream of traditional Christianity, such as

Latter-Day Saints and Christian Scientists, appeared and grew large.

In the decade after World War I, the traditional "Protestant" churches began splitting into two groups, fundamentalists and those who would accept the new scientific theories. In short, we became a nation of numerous religious and non-religious groups, all of which had to tolerate each other.

The Supreme Court prayer decision formally recognized that Jews, Catholics, Episcopalians, Southern Baptists, deists and agnostics do not say the same prayers in the same way, and they do not interpret the same Bible in the same way. In other words, there cannot be "non-sectarian" religious services which do not offend some segment of the society.

A Basic Psychological Issue

The most interesting paragraphs of Mr. Moritz' article, from the Theosophical point of view, involve an analysis of the problem in terms of attitudinal changes which must still take place:

If religious freedom and tolerance is to be maintained, then, just as the founding fathers foresaw, the government must be neutral. It cannot support any religion. We must make some changes in practice even though the traditions we change are long established.

The counter-argument to this is that atheists, deists and agnostics are un-American and not to be tolerated in our society. If they are ignored, so the argument goes, all the other churches can agree on prayers and Bible lessons. The latter suggestion is absurd, of course. If all Judeo-Christian churches could agree on prayers and Bible lessons, they would unite.

The claim that non-Christians have no place in our society is much more disturbing, however, because it is a statement of almost un-American intolerance. It is basically a claim that all Americans do not have equal rights and do not have the right to make their own decisions about religion.

The only answer that seems readily apparent is that some segments of the Christian community are so insecure in their faith that they feel it can only survive through force.

These people seem to feel that if children are not constantly bombarded with religious propaganda, they will fall away from the church. They seem afraid that the church and family, which should be the religious training grounds, are inadequate for the task. And, what is more the pity, they seem incapable of analyzing that fear and remedying it.

Anglican Cleric Speaks Out

Closely following the publication of Bishop John Robinson's *Honest to God* (see THEOSOPHY 51:256), another Anglican clergyman, John Pearce-Higgins, went on record as objecting to the Thirty-nine Articles to which he had to give formal assent when installed as a canon. He explained his action to a reporter for the *Daily Telegraph* (London, May 27) as an effort "to draw attention to the frightful dishonesty in the church." Canon Pearce-Higgins added:

> I wanted to raise the simple moral question of honesty. I take the view that the 39 Articles are not capable of acceptance and incompatible with modern knowledge.
>
> It should not be necessary to assent to them as a condition of taking office required by law. I did in fact make the assent formally which in itself is dishonest.
>
> In a sense I was playing this off the cuff in the hope that something might develop and that the issue might be taken further. I think many bishops share my view and there is a general feeling that this is most undesirable.
>
> I hope that other individual clergy will feel minded to make a similar protest to let it be known what the feeling is.

Bible's Value Questioned

Less than two months later, the Canon followed up his initial attack by criticizing the Bible "as a record heavy with wrong history and unfilled prophecies" (New York *Times,* Aug. 11). In an address at the closing session of the Modern Churchmen's Congress at Cambridge, he said: "I consider the present use of the Bible made by the average Christian teacher to be one of the greatest obstacles to human brotherhood and interracial understanding that exists." The account continues:

> The use of the Bible in an age of science is hardly possible until it is admitted that the Bible is only one among the holy books of the world, the Canon said. Christian ministers, he said, must start to discover non-Christian literature, and Christian scholars to "state fearlessly that there was much in the Bible that, if taken literally at least, was just plain wrong." "Some of the history is wrong," the canon said, "some of the details are obviously garbled, incidents and events have got out of context, prophecies were not fulfilled always."

Some of the reasons for these many and various inaccuracies may

be found listed in *Isis Unveiled* II, 470. There H.P.B. states:

> We must choose perforce between two methods—either to accept the *Bible* exoterically or esoterically. Against the former we have the following facts: That, after the first copy of the *Book of God* has been edited and launched on the world by Hilkiah, this copy disappears, and Ezra has to make a *new Bible*, which Judas Maccabeus finishes; that when it was copied from the horned letters into square letters, it was corrupted beyond recognition; that the *Masorah* completed the work of destruction; that, finally, we have a text, not 900 years old, abounding with omissions, interpolations, and premeditated perversions; and that, consequently, as this Masoretic Hebrew text has fossilized its mistakes, and the key to the "Word of God" is lost, no one has a right to enforce upon so-called "Christians" the divagations of a series of hallucinated and, perhaps, spurious prophets, under the unwarranted and untenable assumption that the author of it was the "Holy Ghost" in *propria personæ*.

Some Psychological Implications

After pointing out a few "errors" and unfulfilled prophecies, Canon Pearce-Higgins says:

> I have come to the painful conclusion that for a very large number of the supporters of religion, their religious views are infantile psychological systems which have been acquired under the stress of the early years of life, which give emotional satisfaction to the particular psychological make-up of the individual.

Dr. Arthur Guirdham in his *Christ and Freud* offers a penetrating analysis of the "guilt complex" as engendered and fostered by orthodox Christianity. In one of the early chapters, he writes:

> Perhaps the most important psychiatric factor in organized Christianity is a sense of guilt. It has been well said that Christianity is an attempt to escape from guilt and Buddhism a means of escaping sorrow. . . . A sense of guilt to a neurotic degree has been obvious in the history of the more extreme Protestant sects since their foundation. . . . The person whose religion rests chiefly on belief in personal survival and the reward of heaven is merely utilising well-worn and well-established psychological mechanisms for comfort and self-delusion.

Anglican Rector Upholds Reincarnation

A "monthly letter to church members" of the Episcopalian Church in Alvechurch, Worchester, by the Reverend Patrick Blakiston (May) has boldly championed the idea of reincarnation.

This thirty-page periodical also circulates to the parishes of three neighboring towns.

The Rev. Blakiston covers many familiar points in favor of reincarnation:

> That innermost part of your nature and mine which makes us different from all other human beings existed before we were born and will survive after we are dead. Our immortal souls have been evolving through countless ages, coming back to earth from time to time as we are reincarnated for the further fulfilment of our individual destinies which are linked up, in some cases most intimately . . . with the destinies of other people.
>
> One of the basic laws of our moral and spiritual nature is that we reap what we sow. This is known as the law of karma. "Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit." (Matthew 7:17). But if, after the death of my present body, I look back on my past life and see all the wrongs I have done to others ("a corrupt tree bringing forth evil fruit") I shall wish to be re-incarnated in due course in order that I may make amends. . . .

Church History and Rebirth

Rev. Blakiston, after quoting a number of passages from the Bible, states:

> In spite, however, of what Jesus said on the subject, reincarnation did not become an ingredient of "orthodox" Christianity. There were reasons for this, of which I will speak on a future occasion. But it is worth recording that one of the most eminent early defenders of the Christian Faith, Origen of Alexandria (185-254 A.D.), taught in no uncertain terms the facts of the pre-existence and transmigration of souls. So did his disciple Pamphilus, Saint and Martyr (240-309) . . . The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church says that reincarnation "was implicitly condemned by the Councils of Lyons (1274) and Florence (1439), which affirmed that souls go immediately to heaven, purgatory, or hell." But the Church of England is not bound by the decisions of mediaeval Roman Catholic Councils and, even if it could be shown that the undivided ancient Church officially forbade belief in reincarnation, the 21st of our Articles of Religion says "General Councils may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God."
>
> On another occasion I shall endeavour to show that the knowledge of reincarnation, so far from destroying one's Christian faith, mightily strengthens it. . . . No doubt all this will earn me the title of "heretic" and there will be those who will wish me, as they wish the Bishop of Woolwich [author of the widely-circulated paperback *Honest to God*], to be burnt at the stake. . . . To

think rightly about pre-existence is to know by intuition and experience that it is a fact.

A report received from England advises that the foregoing letter stirred such an interest that a special Episcopalian discussion was held June 25 to talk further about reincarnation.

Notes on Psychical Research

During the past few years it has become evident that various distinguished members of the Society for Psychical Research have been and are hospitable to an essentially theosophical explanation of séance phenomena. For example, *William James on Psychical Research* (Viking Press, 1960), compiled and edited by Gardner Murphy, indicates the extent to which the independent philosophizing of William James has contributed to a more valid approach than that provided by the mere sifting of séance data.

In his introduction, Dr. Murphy discloses why James rejected evidence of postmortem memories as proof that the genuine "spirit" of the departed person was represented in the séance. Dr. Murphy quotes James to the effect that, in séance, the supposed identity may simply be a "spirit redivivus, and recollecting and willing in a certain momentary way."

The Hodgson Communications

By an interesting turn of karma, William James was called upon to study evidence that the same Richard Hodgson who "exposed" H.P.B.'s phenomena in India was communicating through the celebrated medium, Mrs. Piper, after Hodgson's death. On this point James summarizes in a manner which certainly suggests the Theosophical interpretation—fitting with his proposition that a "spirit redivivus" may be communicating in "a certain momentary way." James wrote:

> There seems fair evidence of the reality of psychometry; so that this scheme covers the main phenomena in a vague general way. In particular, it would account for the "confusion" and "weakness" that are such prevalent features: the system of physical traces corresponding to the given spirit would then be only imperfectly aroused. It tallies vaguely with the analogy of energy finding its way from higher to lower levels. The sitter, with his desire to receive, forms, so to speak, a drainage-opening or sink; the medium, with her desire to personate, yields the nearest lying material to be drained off; while the spirit desiring to communi-

cate is shown the way by the current set up, and swells the latter by its own contributions.

An Open Mind—and a Philosophy

So James was by no means inclined to adopt the usual spiritualist explanation, and rather insisted on caution regarding belief in immortality—even though he had frankly avowed an inclination toward reincarnation-philosophy in the preface to the second edition of *Human Immortality*. In his report on the Piper-Hodgson control, Dr. James continued:

> It is enough to indicate these various possibilities, which a serious student of this part of nature has to weigh together, and between which his decision must fall. His vote will always be cast (if ever it be cast) by the sense of the dramatic probabilities of nature which the sum total of his experience has begotten in him. *I myself feel as if an external will to communicate were probably there,* that is, I find myself doubting, in consequence of my whole acquaintance with that sphere of phenomena, that Mrs. Piper's dream-life, even equipped with "telepathic" powers, accounts for all the results found. But if asked whether the will to communicate be Hodgson's, or be some mere spirit-counterfeit of Hodgson, I remain uncertain and await more facts, facts which may not point clearly to a conclusion for fifty or a hundred years.

Interchangeability of Senses

We are all familiar with the fact that when a person loses one "sense" other senses are heightened, taking over part of the duties of the non-working faculty. Now, however, *Time* for Jan. 25 recounts the strange case of a 22-year-old girl, an epileptic patient at Russia's Sverdlov Clinic for Nervous Disorders, who can literally "see" with her fingertips. Under her psychiatrist's direction, Rosa Kuleshova demonstrated her ability:

> Dr. Goldberg blindfolded Rosa and had the blindfold checked. Then Rosa opened a book at random, passed the fingertips of her right hand lightly over the page, and fluently read the text aloud. She did the same with a newspaper. Handed a snapshot, Rosa stroked the surface and said: "What a cute little girl with a ribbon in her hair and her face tilted upward!"

"Sight" by "Feel"

It seems that several members of Rosa's family were blind, and that she, though sighted, "learned to read Braille as well as the

printed word, and made no sharp distinction in her mind between the two kinds of reading. Her senses of touch and sight had become practically interchangeable."

The question was naturally raised, Had Rosa developed her Braille touch so highly that she could feel the shapes of characters in letterpress printing? The following experiment answered that question:

> With a sheet of glass over a printed page, Rosa could no longer read fine print, but she could still make out headline type in strong light. Rosa can also "feel" colors. White, she says, is smooth; red is coarse-grained; and blue is wavy. Again determined to rule out a reaction to textures, the neurologists tested her with colored light. They shone a red light on a light green book, making it look blue. Rosa called it blue. When the red light was switched off, and the green looked green again, the blindfolded Rosa expressed astonishment that the book could change color.

The account concludes: "Though Rosa's brain-wave pattern changes when she is reading with her fingers, neurologists have not yet been able to find any connection between her strange faculty and her epilepsy. The Russian experts can only assume that Rosa has in her fingertips a network of fine nerve endings that are sensitive to light."

"H.P.B. wrote long ago that all the senses are *astral,* distinct from the physical *organs,* and are *interchangeable;* also that they are as subject to mental impression as to physical. Herein is something for spiritualists and 'psychic' Theosophists to ponder over not less than others." (THEOSOPHY 11:496.)